

Bishop COZENS's ARGUMENT,

PROVING, THAT

Adultery works a Dissolution of the Marriage.

Being the Substance of several of Bishop COZENS's Speeches in the House of Lords, upon the Debate of the Lord ROSS'S Case.

Taken from Original Papers writ in the Bishop's own Hand.

THE Question is indefinitely to be spoken of, *Whether a Man being divorced from his Wife, who hath committed Adultery, and is convicted of it, may Marry himself to another Wife or no, during the Life of her which is divorced.*

The place in St. Matthew the 5th, repeated again St. Matthew the 19th, has great Persecuity: If it be not lawful for any Man to put away his Wife, and Marry again, except it be in the Case of Fornication, (for the displacing the Words, by putting the Exception before the Marriage, cannot alter the Sense) then a *contrario*, it must of necessity follow, That if the Wife be put away for Fornication, the Husband by the Tenor of Christ's Words is left free to Marry again; which Freedom is not allow'd the Adulteress her self, nor to any Man else that shall Marry her.

St. Mark and S. Luke have been oppos'd to S. Matthew; and it has been said, that Christ's words in S. Matthew did not properly belong to Christ's Disciples, or the Christian Church, as the words in S. Mark and S. Luke, which are absolute, do; which is a saying that neither I, nor, I think, no body else ever heard of before: For Christ's Sermon in the Mount was spoken to his Disciples, and especially belonged to Christians.

'Tis clear they are spoken to his Disciples; for he says to them, that they are *the Salt of the Earth, and the Light of the World*; and that they are *blessed, when they suffer persecution for his Name's sake*; which no Man will say, or apply to the Jews.

'Tis true, that in the 19th Chapter of S. Matthew, Christ answers the Scribes and Pharisees, who came to tempt him with their Question, *Whether it was lawful for a man to put away his Wife for any cause, as they said Moses had permitted them to do.* But the Answer that Christ gave them, That it was not lawful, *but only in the case of Adultery, for men to put away their Wives, and to marry another*, was a Rule which concerned all Christians to observe for ever after; and for that reason was recorded by S. Matthew.

The words in S. Mark and S. Luke, are not to be taken absolutely, but to be supplied and understood by his words in S. Matthew; as in many other Cases is clear; viz. the Thief upon the Cross, Baptism in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, &c. whereof many Instances may be brought, as the destruction of Niniveh, &c.

But for Christ's words, the Exception confirms the Rule, and infers a Concession, that in the Case of Fornication, the putting away one Wife, and Marrying another, is allowed. It is alike with divers other his Exceptions, which are found in Scripture: For brevity, I will instance in this one (*viz.*) *Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish*: Upon which Text, if I or any Bishop else were to Preach, I believe we should not discharge our Duty, unless we should tell the People, That if by the Grace of God they did repent, they should not perish.

The Exception here, *nisi*, unless, is parallel with the 1 Kings 3. 18. *None were in the house, except we twain* they Two therefore were, others were not.

Such Exceptions proceeding from natural Equity, are tacitly implied in Laws, tho pronounced in general Terms.

But as to the Exception here, the Words are not capable of any other Sense than as I have observed; for except that Restraint be referred to Marrying again, the Sense would run thus, *Whoever puts away his Wife commits Adultery*; which stands not with Truth or Reason; since it is not the Dismission that is Adulterous, but the Marriage of another. It is, therefore, the plain drift of our Saviour to teach the Pharisee, that the Marriage of a Second Wife after a Dismission of a Former, upon any other cause, except for fornication, is no less than Adultery; thereby inferring, That upon a Just Dismission for Fornication, a second Marriage cannot be branded with Adultery.

Besides, the Pharisee's Question [*Is it lawful for a man to put away his Wife for every cause?*] was not without a plain implication of Liberty to Marry another; which our Saviour well knowing, gives a full Answer, as well to what he meant, as what he said; which had not been perfectly satisfactory, if he had only determined that one part concerning Dismission, and not the other concerning Marriage; which Clause, if Two Evangelists express not, yet it must be teach'd necessarily from the Third; since it is a sure and irrefragable Rule, *That all Four Evangelists make up one perfect Gospel*.

The Rhemists and College of Doway urge for the Popish Doctrine, Rom. 7. 2. *The woman which hath an husband, is bound by the law to her husband as long as he liveth.* But

1. This place is to be Expounded by Christ's Words.
2. St. Paul hath no occasion here to speak of Divorce, but of Marriage whole and sound, as it stands by God's Ordinance.
3. He speaks of a Woman who is under an Husband; so is not she that is divorced from him.
4. St. Paul useth this to his purpose of the Law being dead, to which we are not bound.

Nor is their Doctrine more favoured by 1 Cor. 7. 10. *Let not the woman depart*; as being in her Choice whether she would depart or not: But in the Case of Fornication, she was to depart, or rather be put away, whether she would or not.

The Bond of the Marriage is to be enquired into, what is properly is. Being a Conjugal Promise Solemnly made between a Man and his Wife, That each of them will live together according to God's Holy Ordinance, notwithstanding Poverty or Infirmary, or such other things as may happen during their Lives. Separation from Bed and Board, which is part of their Promise to live together, doth plainly break that part of the Bond whereby they are tied to live together both as to Bed and Board. The distinction betwixt Bed and Board and the Bond, is new, never mentioned in the Scripture, and unknown in the Ancient Church, devised only by the Canonists and the School-men in the Latin Church (for the Greek Church knows it not) to serve the Pope's turn the better, till he got it established in the Council of Trent; at which time, and never before, he laid his Anathema upon all them that were of another Mind; forbidding all Men to Marry and not to make any use of Christ's Concession.

Bed and Board, or Cohabitation, belong to the Essence and Substance of Matrimony; which made Erasmus and Bishop Hall say, *That the distinction of those two from the Bond, is mere Chimerical, and Fancy.*

The promise of Constancy and mutual Forbearance, if it hinders Divorce as to the Bond, hinders it also as to Bed and Board; beaulte the same Bed, and the same Table were promised in the Marriage Contract; but the Promise does not extend even to Tolerating Adultery, or Malicious Desertion; which, according to God's Ordinance, Dissolves the Marriage.

Our Saviour speaks of Divorces Instituted by the Mosaic Law; but they were no other than Divorces from the Bond.

The Form of the Bill of Divorce, among the Jews was this, *Be Expelled from me, and let for any Body else*. To give the Bill of Divorce, is from the Hebrew Root *Shal*, which is to break, or cut off the Marriage. With this agree the Ancient Canons, Councils, and Fathers of the Church.

Councils, *Nicean*, & *Elib.* forbid the retaining an Adulterous Wife. Council. *Eliber. Aurelian.* & *Arelaten.* give Liberty in such Case to Marry again. *Clement's Constitution*, *Tertullian*, *St. Basil* in his Canons, approved by a General Council

are

Vet. A 3 6. 23(3)

are for Marrying again. *Concil Venet.* If they Marry in any other Case than Fornication, they are to be *Excommunicated*, and not otherwise. *Concil Wormat.* gives Liberty to the Innocent Party to Marry after a Divorce. *Concil Lateran.* gives leave for the Innocent Party after a Year to Marry again.

Concil. Lateran. If any one take another Wife while a Suit is depending, and afterwards there be a Divorce between him and the First, he may remain with the Second.

Lactantius, S. Hierom and Epiphanius, are for allowance of Marriage after Divorce. *Clement*, *1 Cor. 7.* says, That the Marriage is dissolved by Adultery; and that the Husband, after he hath put her away, is no longer her Husband.

Theophylact on the 16th. of *St. Luke*, says, That *St. Luke* must be interpreted by *S. Matthew*. *S. Hilary* is for marrying again, as *Dr. Falk* saith upon *S. Matthew* the V. The *Eastern Bishops*, in the *Council of Florence*, are for marrying again. *Justin Martyr* speaks of a Christian Woman's giving a bill of Divorce to a Dissolute Husband, without finding any fault with it.

St. Ambrose says, a Man may Marry again, if he put away an Adulterous Wife; *Theodore* said of a Wife who violated the Laws of Marriage: Therefore our Lord requires the Bond or Tie of Marriage to be dissolved.

All the *Greek Church* to this day allow it. *Erasmus, Cajetan,* and other *Papists*: The Civil Law, and the Laws of the Emperor, are clear for it: And the Constitutions of our own Church of England, in the time of *H. 8. E. 6. and Queen Eliz.*

The Practice of the *English Church*: In the Stat. 1 Jac. c. 11. against second Marriages, Divorces are excepted; and in Canon 107. 'tis provided they shall not Marry again; but it is not said such Marriages are void, only the Caution is forfeited: Neither doth the Canon speak of such Separations, wherein the Bond itself is broken, as 'tis by Fornication.

Even the Canon-Law allows Marrying again, in case a Woman seek her Husband's Life: and in case of a Bond-woman. *Gratian* says, in the Case of Adultery Lawful Marriages ought not to be denied. In the Case of an Incurable Leprosie, it was the Advice of *S. Gregory* to *Austin* the Monk, That he that could not contain, should rather Marry. *Bellesmin* owns that the Bond of the Marriage of Infidels is dissolvable; but the Marriage of the Faithful, and of Infidels, is of the same nature; And *Justinian*, a Jesuit, confesses, that it is simply lawful for the Innocent Party to Marry again. And the *Roman Doctors* allow a dissolution of the Bond of Marriage, if the Parties should, after consummation, transfer themselves into a Friery or Nunnery.

The Canons which in the case of Adultery prohibit Marrying in the Life time of the guilty Person, are contrary to Two Ref. Leg. Eccles. Tir. Acts of Parliament made 25 H. 8. and 3 & 4 E. 6. wherein no Canons are allowed that be any way repugnant to the *Laws of God, or the Scripture, the King's Prerogative Royal, and the Statutes of this Land.* 32 Persons were to review the Canon-Law, in which Review, drawn up by *Archbishop Cranmer*, the Innocent Person is permitted to Marry again, according to *Christ's Law and Concession.*

We have Examples of such Marriages in *H. 4. of France, H. 8. of England, Lord Mountjoy, Lord Rich, Bishop Thorborough,* and divers others. And it is observable, That in the Case of the *Marquess of Northampton, 5 E. 6.* who had been divorced for his Lady's Adultery, and Married another before any Act of Parliament made concerning it, an Act which passed afterwards (only two Spiritual, and two Temporal Lords dissenting) declares he had been at liberty by the *Laws of God to Marry*, and did Lawfully Marry another; Where the Act manifestly supposes, that whatever had obtained for Law till that time, was void, as being contrary to *God's Law.*

The most considerable Men of the Reform'd Churches both at home and abroad, are of this Opinion: *Grotius* quotes *Tertullian*, in whose time it was Lawful for the Innocent Party to Marry.

Lancelot Inst. Jur. Can. acknowledges that Divorce is a dissolution of the Marriage.

Selden, who is not likely to contradict the Laws of this Kingdom, maintaineth, That Marriage after Divorce is to be allowed: And in that particular, *Dr. Hammond* doth not contradict him, but is clearly for it.

The Opinion of *Amicus* deserves to be set down at large: Marriage, says he, cannot be dissolved by Men at their pleasure; and for that reason, as it is considered simply and absolutely, it is rightly said to be indissoluble; because Marriage is not only a Civil, but a Divine Conjunction; and is also of that nature, that it cannot be dissolved without detriment to either Party, for it is not so indissoluble, but it may be dissolved for a Cause which God approves as just; for the Indissolubility was not instituted for a Punishment, but for the Comfort of Innocent Persons; and it admits an Exception, wherein God ceases to conjoin. By Adultery two are made not to remain one Flesh: hence it is, that a Contagious Disease is not a Cause of dissolving Marriage. By Adultery the very Essence of the Contract is directly violat'd; but the Contract ceasing, the Bond depending on the Contract necessarily ceases. It is against all reason, that all Matrimonial Duties should be for ever taken away, yet the Bond or Obligation to those Duties should continue. The words of our Lord, *Matth. 5. 32. and 19. 9.* have no distinction or limitation of the putting away, but simply and absolutely approve of putting away; therefore they approve of a putting away, not partial, or to a particular purpose, from Bed and Board, but Total.

None are against the Reform'd Divines, but *Dr. Howson, Mr. Bunney, and Dr. Prideaux.*

Dr. Howson was a professed Adversary to *Dr. Raynolds*, who was a great Maintainer of the Church of England against all the Points of Popery, and particularly in this.

Dr. Taylor, Bishop Hall, Dr. Falk, are for Second Marriages; no Authors against them but the *Council of Trent*, and those of the Church of Rome; whose Credit is only saved by those of our Church who agree with them.

Upon the difference of Explication between *S. Ambrose, Origen,* and *S. Austin*, a new kind of Divorce has been thought of from Bed and Board; but this Divorce, or Name of a Divorce, was unknown to the *Jews and Ancient Christians.*

I said so much before, at the First and Second reading of this Bill, that I was in good hopes to have had no further occasion, given me of answering any Objections against it now; but seeing divers new Arguments have been studied and framed against it since that time, I shall now endeavour to satisfy and clear them all.

1. The First Argument against it, is, That the Separation from Bed and Board doth not dissolve the Bond of Marriage. To which I must Reply, as I did before, That this is a distinction without a difference; newly invented by the *Canonists and Schoolmen*, and never heard of either in the *Old or New Testament*, nor in the times of the Antient Fathers, who accounted the Separation from Bed and Board, to be the Dissolution of the Bond itself.

2. That first Institution of Marriage, that they may be one Flesh, is by Adultery dissolved, when the Adulteress makes herself one Flesh with another Man; and thereby dissolves the first Bond of her Marriage.

3. The Objection, that if the Bond be dissolved, and afterwards, if the Man or Woman be reconciled, they must be Married over again, is no necessary Consequence, no more than 'tis in a Person baptized, who may break his Covenant, and renounce his Baptism; and yet upon true Repentance be received into God's favour by virtue of the first Covenant, without any new Baptism. Suppose a Witch, who they say makes a Compact with the Devil, to renounce her Baptism; should afterwards, by the Grace of God, seriously and truly Repent her self of the Wickedness; I do not believe that any body would take upon him to Baptize her again: and if a Priest should renounce his Orders, and turn Turk, and yet afterwards repent him, and return into the Church: he need not be Re-ordained a second time. The Case will be the same in Marriage.

4. I said heretofore, That the *Roman Doctors* allowed this Dissolution of the Bond, when the Man and Wife, even after the Consummation of Marriage, would transfer themselves into a Friary, or a Nunnery: but because it hath been since doubted, that no Authority can be shewed for this particular, I shall here shew it out of the old Constitutions of the Church of England.

Prov. Will. Lindewode, And in the Case of Religion, that is the true understanding, that to wit, either of them betaking themselves to Religion before Carnal Knowledge, the Bond of the Marriage be dissolved: but if both enter into Religion, and make solemn Profession, then such Marriage is dissolved, even as to the Bond.

5. It hath also been said, that if the Bill pass, it will pass against the Church of England: which I confess, I do not understand: For the Church of England is within the Kingdom of England; and if the Laws of this Kingdom be for the Bill and have declared it by the Assent of the King, Lords, and Commons, as in the Case of the *Marquis of Northampton*, was heretofore declared in the time of *King Edward the 6th.* That by the *Laws of God* the Innocent Party was at liberty to Marry again; Certainly the *Spiritual Lords*, as well as the *Temporal and Commons*, are bound to admit it: and I know not why they should be called the Church of England, that join with the *Council of Trent*, and plead so much to uphold it; rather than others that join with all the Reformed Churches, and plead against that Canon of the Church of Rome, which hath laid an Anathema upon us, if we do not agree with them.

As to the supposed Inconveniencies that will follow upon Marrying again.

1. More Inconveniencies will follow if they be forbidden to Marry again.
2. The Father would be in an uncertainty of the Children, if he should retain the Adulteress.
3. There would be danger of Poysoning, or killing one another, if no Second Marriage were allowed.
4. Where the Parties should consent to new Marriages for their own Lusts, the Magistrates have Power to oversee such Practices.
5. If they be kept altogether by Divorce from Marrying, it would occasion the Innocent Party to Sin.

THE Duke of Norfolk's Case:

WITH REASONS for Passing his BILL.

IF want either of Precedent for a *Parliamentary Divorce*, before going through the tedious and ineffectual Methods of *Doctors Commons*, or of Demonstration of Fact, have hitherto deprived the Duke of Norfolk of that Relief against his Wives Adultery, which the *Divine Law* allows; The late Statute made in the like Case and the Coming in of Two, who while the Duke's former Bill was depending, had been sent away to prevent that Discovery which they now make: cannot but be thought to remove all Objections against an Act of Parliament, not only for the benefit of the Duke, but of the *Publick*; as a means to preserve the Inheritance of so great an Office, and Honours to Persons of the true Religion.

And since *Bishop Cozens* his Argument in the Lord Ross's Case has made it Evident, That those Canons which govern the *Spiritual Court* in this matter, are but the remains of Popery; nothing can be now requisite to satisfy the most scrupulous of the *Reformed Religion*, but to set the Duke's Proofs of his Lady's Adultery in a true Light.

The Reputation which the Dutchess had mainrained, of Wit and Discretion made it difficult for many to believe, that she could be surprized in the very Act of Adultery, as had been formerly prov'd. And though then it appeared, that one *Henry Keemer* lived with the Dutchess, while she went by a feigned Name at an House hired for her at *Fox-Hall*, by *Sir John Germain's* Brother: and that *Nicola*, who then lived with *Sir John*, used to receive *Wool* sent from the Dutchess to *Sir John's* house by the *Cockpit*; the withdrawing of *Nicola*, and carrying with him the *Dutch Maid*, equally Entrusted with the secret on *Sir John's* side left no Evidence of their Constant Conversation, but *Keemer* since dead, and *Susannah Barrington*, who had the like Trust from the Dutchess.

Keemer, though very unwillingly, some years since confessed his living with the Dutchess at *Fox-hall*, where he preterred she was obliged to conceal her self for Debt, and what share *Susannah* had in the secret was unknown, till *Nicola* appeared: *Nicola* coming into *England* sometime since in Expectation of a Service, expressed his readiness to discover what he knew, and to Endeavour to bring with him the *Dutch Maid*.

She proves, That for two Months the first Summer after the King came for *England*, *Sir John German* and the Dutchess lived together as Man and Wife, and were seen in Bed together by her, *Mr. Bryan*, and his VVife, *Sir John's* Sister: and that *Nicholas Hausfur*, *Sir John's* *Valet de Chambre*, used to be assisting to him; as the Dutchess's Woman, *Susannah Barrington*, was to her, at going to Bed, and rising.

Eleanor Vanels
Exam. 22. Feb.
1699.

She proves the like Conversation at *Fox-hall*, and the Dutchess's House at the *Millbank*, till the Duke's first Bill for a Divorce was depending; within which time *Nicholas Hausfur*, by *Sir John's* Order, carried her away, and *Susannah Barrington*, with intention of going for *Holland*, to prevent their being Examined to what they knew; but the wind proving contrary, they could not go till the Bill was rejected; and then *Sir John* fetch'd back *Susannah*, who was most useful to the Dutchess; but *Hausfur* went for *Holland* with *Ellen*.

He confirms *Ellen's* Evidence in every particular; and besides the Persons mention'd by *Ellen* as privy to *Sir John's* lying with the Dutchess, names *Sir John's* Brother *Daniel*. *Nicholas* having been found very trusty, his Master sent for him to return to his Service; and gave him the opportunity of proving the Continuance of the same Adulterous Conversation at several Times and Places, from the Summer 1692. to the 26th. of April 1696. He swears he had after his return to *Sir John's* Service, seen them in Bed together at *Sir John's* House, at the *Cockpit* and at the Dutchess's House at *Millbank*, and where she now lives; and used to be let into the Dutchess's Apartment by *Susannah Barrington*, or *Keemer*. Nor can any Man who shall read the ample Testimonials given *Mr. Hausfur* by *Sir John*; by the last of which it appears that he served him faithfully as his Steward, reasonably question *Hausfur's* Credit.

Another who had been advanced by *Sir John* from his Footman to *Mr. Hausfur's* place, *William Bayle*, and from thence to a good Office in the Excise, very unwillingly confirmed the Testimony of *Hausfur* and the *Dutch Maid*, not only as to the time of their going from the Service of *Sir John* and the Dutchess, but though being no Foreigner, he could not so easily be sent away to prevent discovery, and therefore was not let so far into the secret as *Hausfur* and the *Dutch Maid*; yet he swears the Dutchess used to come mask'd to his Master's House, that he has gone with him as far as the *Horse-ferry* towards her House at the *Mill-bank*; that then his Master sometimes lay out all Night, and the next morning he has carri'd Linnen and Cloaths for his Master to *Keemer's* House, or *Keemer* has fetch'd them from him: And this he proves to have been since the rejecting the former Bill, and about five Years since, when he was succeeded by *Hausfur*, as before he had succeeded *Hausfur*.

Two other Foreigners, *La Fontaine*, who had lived with *Sir John*, and was Served with Summons at the Dutchess's House at *Drayton*; and *Hugonee*, who ran away from the Lord *Haversham's* since Summons was taken out against him; seem to have had the same Trust that *Hausfur* had: for both declared, That nothing should oblige them to betray their Master's Secrets: One said, No Court could dispense with his Oath of Secrecy: and both declared they would immediately go beyond Sea. Summons have been taken out for *Mr. Brian* and his VVife, and *Sir John Germain's* Brother (who are, or lately were in Town) to confess

or

or deny what *Nichola* and *Ellen* appeal to them for: and it cannot be imagined that *Sir John* should chuse the Honour of being thought to have to do with a *Dutchess*, before the Clearing her and himself from the Imputation, by bringing his Relations to disprove the Charge, if what is sworn to be within their knowledge is false.

And if *Sir John's* Vanity should prevail with him, at least it is to be presumed, that his Relations would be more just to him and the Lady, than to suffer any thing to pass against them, which they could with Truth and Justice prevent.

But since none of them appear, the World will believe their absenting more than a thousand Witnesses, in confirmation of what *Mr. Hausieur*, *Ellen* and *Bayly*, have sworn. Whose Evidence not only stands untouch'd by any thing offered by the *Dutchess's* Witnesses, but is plainly confirmed by them in the principal parts.

This being the nature of the proofs, 'tis observable,

1. That there never yet was any Case of this kind, where the Evidence was not liable to greater Objections than can be made to this.

Though in the latest Case of this kind, there was full Conviction of the Ladies having Children while she lived separate from her Husband; and the presumption was very violent whose the Children were; yet this was but presumption, and that was weakned by the presumption in Law that they were the Husbands; especially since there was no direct proof of the Lover's ever lying with her.

2. Tho in that case, by reason of the interval of Parliament, and fear of the deaths of Witnesses, a Suit was begun in *Doctors Commons*, 'twas taken from thence while the Suit was depending; therefore that was rather an Objection against proceeding in Parliament than an Argument for it.

3. In that Case, several Witnesses were examined at the Bars of both Houses, who had not been examined at *Doctors Commons*, nor any notice given of their Names before their Examination.

4. It appears by that Case, and the present, that the Examinations in Parliament are more solemn and certain than those of the Spiritual Court; which depend too much upon the Honesty of the Register, or his Deputy.

5. Before that Case, Parliaments have either broken through the Rules which bind the Spiritual Court, as in the Case of the Duke of Norfolk, 1 *Eliz.* where the Parliament ratified a Marriage, as lawful according to God's Law; tho protracted and letted, by reason of certain Decrees and Canons of the Popes Law; or else have dissolved a Marriage where there had been no application to *Doctors Commons*, as in the Case of

2. & 3. *W. M.* Mrs. *Wharton*, who had been married to Mr. *Gambel*; and yet there had been no Examination of Witnesses, but what had been before the two Houses.

So long before, in the Case of *Sir Ralph Sadler*, upon proof before the two Houses that the Lady *Sadlers* former Husband had deserted her and disappeared for Four Years before she Married *Sir Ralph*, the Parliament Legitimated her Children by

Sir Ralph.

Whereas some Object against the Passing the Bill, as if it would countenance a Jurisdiction in the House of Lords to examine to such matters, in the first Instance or Originally; the Objection would be the same if it had begun, as it might, in the House of Commons; but in truth would be of equal force against most private and several publick Acts, occasioned by the examination of Witnesses, or Notoriety of Fact.

Since therefore the Duke has so long, and so often in vain endeavoured to be freed from a Lady, publicly famed and proved to have lived with *Sir John Germain*, as his Wife; the Duke's former disappointments cannot but be powerful Arguments for his speedy obtaining that Justice which the Spiritual Court cannot give him; their Power reaching no further than to that liberty of living as *she list*; some years since settled by Articles: But as none of less Art and Oratory than her Counsel could have turned this into a License to commit Adultery, if *she list*, or a Pardon afterwards; had there not been evidence of her Acting according to such Construction, the Duke would have hoped she had repented of the former Injuries he had received from her; but now hopes she shall not longer continue to bear the Name of his Wife, and put him in danger of being succeeded by *Sir John Germain's* Issue; or deprive him of the expectation of leaving his Honours, Offices, and Estate, to a Protestant Heir.



BY Vertue of an Order, Obtain'd from His Grace the Duke of Norfolk, Earle Marshal of England: *Jeremiah Wilkins*, is hereby Authoriz'd to Print, and Publish His Case, and that no other do presume to Print, or Publish the same.

By His Grace the Duke of Norfolk's Special Command.